



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/249,660	02/12/1999	YUKIHISA NAKAJO	P 245595	1181

7590

04/28/2003

Pillsbury Winthrop LLP  
Intellectual Property Group  
725 South Figueroa Street, Suite 2800  
Los Angeles, CA 90017-5406

EXAMINER

PSITOS, ARISTOTELIS M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2653

DATE MAILED: 04/28/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/249,660

Applicant(s)

NAKAJO, YUKIHISA

Examiner

Aristotelis M Psitos

Art Unit

2653

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 13 and 14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-3 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 13 and 14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 March 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

Art Unit: 2653

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114*

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/11/03 has been entered.

Claims 1-3 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 5.

### *Drawings*

The new drawings filed 3/11/03 have been approved. The examiner thanks applicant's cooperation in providing such.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. As newly amended, the claims recite the desired result that the "tendency ....is canceled ...". The examiner fails to find clear adequate support in the specification as originally filed for such language. The elected species refers to the ability of offsetting the tracking signal in accordance to find a particular point in which the absolute value of the te signal is obtained, and thereby shifting the laser beam so as to minimize such absolute value – radially outward to the track center (page 27 of the disclosure). Although the disclosure refers to decreasing the influence of residual heat from the adjoining inner track, there is no clear description (as originally filed) that such is CANCELED.

Art Unit: 2653

The examiner has read applicant's comments with respect to the prior art and this claimed language but maintains the new matter rejection accordingly.

The examiner considers the phrase "is canceled" not to be supported. Alternatively, if applicant replaces such with the phrase ... is minimized ... the examiner would no longer maintain this rejection.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which applicant(s) regard as their invention.

Claim 13 concludes with a wherein clause, requiring a sample and hold circuit; however, since no such sample and hold circuit and or ability to pass any signal to such a element is positively recited in the remainder of the claim, this conclusion/desired result does not positively follow from the claim language. If such an ability, e.g. the addition of having a sample and hold circuit provided for processing the output of the tracking control step, where properly provided for, then this position would no longer be maintained.

Similarly, claim 14 requires/recites such ability, but no such element is positively recited in the remainder of the claim.

AS FAR AS THE CLAIMS RECITE POSITIVE LIMITATIONS and are interpreted by the examiner, the following art rejections are made.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2653

Applicant cannot rely upon the foreign priority papers to overcome this rejection because a translation of said papers has not been made of record in accordance with 37 CFR 1.55. See MPEP § 201.15.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
  2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
  3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
  4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
4. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takeda et al.

Applicants' attention is drawn to figure 4 and its disclosure, starting at col. 4 line 7.

As depicted, there are offset values for optimum mode/signal performance. Such performance yields the newly introduced/claimed limitations.

With respect to claim 14, applicant's attention is drawn to figures 3 & 4 in Takeda et al and the appropriate accompanying disclosure. The control ability is performed by element 7 while element 20 is interpreted by the examiner to retain a storage circuit for storing optimum offset values.

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the claim has been considered but is not deemed persuasive.

Art Unit: 2653

Applicant's arguments focuses on the lack of any description in the Takeda et al document for the claimed tendency limitation(s). As far as the examiner can ascertain from the document, such is considered inherently present for the following reason(s).

The Takeda et al is an optical recording and reproducing system, and as such the material (disc) is heated in order to form the pits/phase change of the material. Inherently a specified amount of thermal energy is imparted, and such thermal energy dissipates through the record medium material. When the laser beam (during recording) is offset from the track center the resultant (residual heat) from a previously inner diameter track would have a diminish<sup>ed</sup> influence upon the newly recording<sup>ed</sup> information and hence ~~such~~ meets the claimed limitation as interpreted by the examiner, i.e., minimizes the influence.

While it is true that the Takeda et al system provides for track de-centering either inwardly or outwardly, plus or minus values of alpha, the claims do not distinguish there over.

5. Claims 13 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aoshima considered with either Watanabe et al, Takeda et al.

Aoshima discloses an optical recording and reproducing system wherein although tracking control is performed, there is no offset ability for such. Aoshima does however recognize the influence of the laser power upon the recording medium and its impact upon the formation of the recording pits.

Either of the secondary references teaches the ability of the offset in order to compensate for the conditions and in particular Takeda et al is considered to enable a variety of offset values (alphas) in order to optimize the offset ability accordingly.

It would have been obvious to modify the base system of Aoshima with the above additional the offset teaching from either of the secondary references, motivation is to compensate for the signals and record signals accordingly.

Again, the examiner concludes that as the recording signal is offset from the center of the track, the influence of any residual heat in the inner track would be minimized.

### **Conclusion**

Applicant's arguments have been considered, but due to the above interpretation of the claimed invention and the operation of the systems as stated above, the examiner considers such to meet.

Art Unit: 2653

Due to time restraints, the examiner was unable to contact applicant's attorney prior to issuance of this office action. Nevertheless, the examiner would be more than receptive for any telephone interview after applicant and his representative have digested the above position.

Okawa is cited as prior art systems using appropriate control capabilities to perform various servo signal processing.

Any inquiries concerning missing papers/references, etc. must be directed to Group 2600 Customer Services at (703) 306-0377.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Aristotelis M Psitos whose telephone number is (703) 308-1598. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thursday 8 - 4.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William R. Korzuch can be reached on (703) 305-6137. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9314 for regular communications and (703) 872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Aristotelis M Psitos  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 2653



AMP  
April 22, 2003